







pecially by a more vigorous and distinct application of it, to the great sin of our country and invigorated by all the kindred exclusive divisions. Dr. Cheever is a new dealing death-lion up on the matter, not giving way to discouragement and predicting that nothing can be accomplished. — But Dr. Cheever, says Gerrit Smith, has, "in a good degree, outgrown his religion."

This explains, if we mistake not, what *origin*. Mr. Smith would gladly perceive himself that Dr. Cheever has outgrown — and what religion it is that he tells the Syracuse Nominating Convention, we need press and hotness to display, "by the simple religion of reason &c. It is the same Religion that he so strongly opposed in his "Three Discourses on the Religion of Reason," published in 1839. We think he will not deny that such is the meaning of his Letter to the Syracuse Convention, published as a part of its proceedings, and with its funds. — Those three discourses are levelled directly against the current belief of Christians in far sixteen centuries, that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are of divine authority, "given by inspiration of God," and against the system of religion as before understood to be taught by the great majority of intelligent and exemplary Christians of all the ages and countries in which they have lived — the religious beliefs of Luther, of John Knox, of the Puritans, of Edwards, Hopkins, Wesley, Cooper, Howard, Withers, &c. Sharp, Clarkson, and of the principal pioneers of the anti-slavery enterprise in America, in the beginning of their courageous labors, not excepting William Lloyd Garrison and Gerrit Smith, when their heaviest blows were struck, particularly when the latter, by "preaching Bible politics" wrought wonders in Central New York.

This religion, described as being "the current or popular religion of the country," and thus, injuriously identified with Unitarianism, the so-called religion of the country, and analyzed by its leading teachers, denominated evangelical or orthodox, the "Three Discourses on the Religion of Reason" elaborately opposed, and then proceeded to say, —

"Thus have I set before you, as far as I well could, with in the narrow limits of a single discourse, the religion of nature. If the one great direct object of true religion is the protection of natural rights, then we must have a natural religion to accomplish it. Natural rights never have been, and never will be protected, by artificial religions. — Current and the fact that they are cloven down the earth over, is conclusive evidence that artificial religions prevail the earth over. Friend of Temperance, friend of Peace, friend of Freedom, work on against drinking Drinks, and War, and slavery, but flatter yourselves with no hope of permanent or extensive success — until the current religion has been supplanted by the religion of nature. Seeker of reform in politics! the current religion hinders you in your way, and slavery, and every one are our policies, they are nevertheless no worse than our religion. Nay, they are always one with it. The State is never more rotten than the Church."

The ground was here distinctly and defiantly taken, by Gerrit Smith, as a political Reformer, that the belief in the divine authority of the Bible, must be "supplanted by the religion of nature" as set forth in the "three Discourses," before any political reform could take place, either permanent or extensive. And he virtually summoned the friends of Temperance, of Peace, and of Freedom, to enlist with him, in that enterprise.

We cannot help understanding the Letter to the Syracuse Convention, as looking to the same object. It breathes the same spirit. It partakes of the same discouragement in respect to political action against intemperance and Slavery, until "the current religion" shall have been first overthrown. It advises large expenditure of labor and money for the former, in comparison with the latter.

The convention publishes the Letter with its proceedings. One or two of the Resolutions apparently from the same writer, advise similar in regard. Standing by themselves and considered as, from our stand point, we might construe them, we could agree with them. But construed in the light of the Letter and of the "Three Discourses on the Religion of Reason," they form a part of a web in which we cannot but be entangled.

If the Liberty Party, having become disengaged in its enterprise of direct political action for a national abolition of slavery is to fail, not into a hypothetical abolition party, is to make feeble efforts for increasing its votes, and use its nominating Conventions for Theological effect, in the enterprise of "supplanting" Bible orthodoxy, by the "religion

of Reason," we must, of course, be disappointed out of the circle.

But we do not believe that the Liberty party will ever vent in deliberately intended. We do not attribute to any one present, a deliberate design to transform the party into a theological, or rather anti-theological engine, against the Bible. We are tracing the natural tendencies of things, and looking at the facts as to us they seem to exist. The Convention was small. It had little time to deliberate. The numbers were of diverse Theological sentiments. What took place was not the result of calculation and consultation. It was rather the natural working of cause and effect. Lack of faith had produced despondency, this, in turn, had generated still deeper unbelief. Both together had pushed reformers into divorcing race after experience. The failure of one expedient after another, had at length precipitated at least one leading mind upon the ultimate expedient, that of "supplanting" Bible religion, by the "religion of reason," in which all calculations of expediency, in rivalry of absolute Right, as demanded by the Bible, have their origin.

In Europe, near the close of the last century, a terrible but instructive drama was enacted. The despotisms of a corrupt State, upheld by a corrupt church, roused human nature itself to resistance. Other expedients had failed. The funt one was the expedient of overthrowing, not only a corrupt church, but the Bible itself, that had been claimed as that was also regarded as the foundation of that church. "The religion of reason" so called, was enthroned on the ashes of the execrated Bible. It kind its day. It produced its natural fruits. The original despotism was overthrown, and successive and bloodier despotisms rose and fell, in succession, one after another. Why was this? The "supplanting" of the religion of the Bible, by the so-called "religion of Reason," (as distinguished from that of the Bible) was the "supplanting" of the revealed will of God, the law of absolute, authoritative, immutable Right, by the supremacy of human reason, by calculations of the expedient, by estimates of probable consequences and results. Nothing else could have happened: nothing else can ever happen, in such a case. No people ever threw off the authority of God's word, and retained any authoritative rule of duty, or any guide of action, but calculations of expediency. — Though all the confuted and bloody scenes of French anarchy, the so-called religion or Philosophy of Reason, with its ethics of utility, expediency, and calculations of consequences, reigned supreme — and history, for our benefit, has recorded the results. Thus admonished, with Bibles in their hands, and with the habit of reverently reading them, the great majority of American Abolitionists, will not tread the same path. Well will it be for the church and the State, in America, if hearing the voice of history, and doing works meet for repentance, they shall prevent the irreligious masses, educated and uneducated, white and colored, bond and free, from resorting to the terrible remedy of the French revolutionists. — That remedy is not ours!

As for attempting to supplant the religion of the Bible, by a "religion of Reason" too feebly developed, or too imperfectly exercised, not to have discovered the divine authority of the Bible, we must first throw away our reason, before we could harbor the thought of it. To attempt it as a means of bringing the people up to the duty of voting against slavery and the rum traffic, we should regard as singularly suicidal. It was from the Bible we learned that "it is not for Kiags to drink wine, nor Priests strong drink." By the Bible we were first taught the duty of choosing wise and good rulers, to rule the people with just judgment, and that he that rules over men must be just ruling in the fear of God. We have never heard of a people without the Bible, who used the ballot-box for the abolition of slavery. And we know of very few now, who do it steadily, except in obedience to the divine command in the Bible.

In casting our votes high, we have not been careful to scrutinize closely the theological beliefs of the candidates. We have known few if any, among the professed Orthodox Christians, who have done so. We would suppose that John Quincy Adams, a Greek Philosopher, ever took a lesson Orthodoxy's motto, that he should. And Hiram Greeley, the known Unitarianist, is, today, the official spokesman of

Protestants of the so-called Orthodox ministers in the Free States. Hitherto, unless with a portion of the "American Party," we have known no attempts to rally or manage a political party for theological purpose.

Are we now to have the first example of that kind in our National politics? If so, we shall find it necessary to re-examine the subject of voting. We shall feel quite at liberty to withhold our support for a candidate, whose unneeded theological and political beliefs, impel him to proclaim the necessity of "supplanting" the theological belief in the divine authority of the Bible, by his own belief in the paramount authority of his so-called "religion of reason" — as the only means of securing extensive and permanent political reform — a candidate who communicates, through the nominating convention, in a political party, his conviction that a less amount of labor and funds should be expended for securing votes, than for the "uplifting" process in which he is engaged. We shall find no liberal and intelligent charge of bigotry and exclusiveness, for having declined to join in a political crusade against our own most cherished religious principles, in the ground of which we stand, as reformers. Our friend Gerrit Smith, himself, certainly, will not thus charge us. He knows that we do not question the sincerity of his religious and political convictions, and he will not question ours. He claims the right of utterance and of action, in consistency with his convictions. And he will need the same right to us. Our mutual friendship of thirty years standing, cemented by more than a quarter of a century of active co-operation and mutual counsel, will be strong enough to survive this honest difference of opinion, towards the close of our labors, as it has survived our earnest differences in years past. We have indeed deprecated the necessity of this frank exposure, and have dreaded the task. But we have not conceived the possibility, nor anticipated the contingency of its disturbing the friendship between ourselves and Gerrit Smith.

#### ILLINOIS STATE CONVENTION.

##### NOTICE.

There will be a State Radical Abolition Convention held in the town of Lexington, McLean County, Illinois, as the nineteenth day of September, (Wednesday,) at 10 o'clock A. M., for the purpose of nominating State Electors to support the Nominees of the Radical Abolition Party for President and Vice President of the United States, and also for the purpose of effecting a complete organization of the party throughout the State, for the coming campaign.

It is desirable that every Radical Abolitionist in the State should either be present or send in his name with Post-Office address. Please address all letters to JOHN W. MAHAN, Acting Secy., "of State Central Committee, Lexington, Ills."

Signed

JOHN HORACE, of Ottawa, Ills.  
DR. J. SCOTT, of Ottawa, Ills.  
G. W. BARNETT, of Ottawa, Ills.  
H. H. HINMAN, Pontiac, Ills.  
JOHN W. MAHAN, Lexington, Ills.  
Acting State Central Committee.

Dated Lexington, Ills., Aug. 24, 1860.

#### OHIO STATE CONVENTION.

All who are wavering, by their votes, to recognize Law for American Slavery are, without respect to color, hereby notified that there will be a CONVENTION OF RADICAL ABOLITIONISTS in Oberlin, Lorain Co., Ohio, Oct. 3rd (Wednesday,) at 10½ o'clock A. M. for the purpose of nominating Electors for President and Vice President of the United States, in the Radical Abolition ticket, and to attend to any other business that may be necessary.

All the friends are requested to be present either in person or by Delegates in a letter. A full notice is desired.

Letters may be directed to T. B. McCORMICK, Box 48, Oberlin, Ohio.

O. M. BROWN, Esq. of Oberlin, Ohio.  
W. A. HUNTER, Bryan, Ohio.  
ROBERT GORDON, of Oberlin, Ohio.  
J. P. BARRELL, Oberlin, Ohio.  
T. B. McCORMICK.

From Mexico, we learn that General Miramon was at the Capital raising another army. The Liberals were pressing on with the determination of not letting him out.







